

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/817,365	03/22/2001	Teiji Yamamoto	010417	2367
23850	7590 12/13/2005		EXAMINER	
	NG, KRATZ, QUINTO	PICKARD, ALISON K		
1725 K STRE SUITE 1000	EET, NW		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGT	ON, DC 20006	3673		

DATE MAILED: 12/13/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

J.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 7-05) Office Ar	ction Summary	Part of Paper No./Mail Date 2	00054007
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper N	w Summary (PTO-413) No(s)/Mail Date of Informal Patent Application (PTO-15: 	2)
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	ot received.	
<ol> <li>Copies of the certified copies of the prio application from the International Burea</li> </ol>		en received in this National Sta	ige
2. Certified copies of the priority document			
1. Certified copies of the priority document		- Amerikanska - Al	
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C	C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	kaminer. Note the attacl	ned Office Action or form PTO-	152.
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct			, ,
Applicant may not request that any objection to the		•	
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc	epted or b) objected	to by the Examiner.	
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine			
Application Papers			
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	election requirement.		
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.	ur election requirement		
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1 and 4-13</u> is/are rejected.			
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra	wn from consideration.		
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1 and 4-13</u> is/are pending in the appl	ication.		
Disposition of Claims			
closed in accordance with the practice under E	=x рапе Quayle, 1935 (	J.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.	
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa			erits is
<i>'</i> —	s action is non-final.		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on			
Status			
<ul> <li>Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.</li> <li>If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period</li> <li>Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).</li> </ul>	(36(a). In no event, however, may will apply and will expire SIX (6) No. c, cause the application to become	y a reply be timely filed  ##ONTHS from the mailing date of this comm  ###BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	unication.
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D			DAYS,
Period for Reply			
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap			ss
,	Examiner Alison K. Pickard	Art Unit	
Office Action Summary	09/817,365	YAMAMOTO ET AL.	
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	I Application No	Annicantiel	

Application/Control Number: 09/817,365 Page 2

Art Unit: 3673

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Specification

1. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: claim 1 does not have proper written support in the specification. It appears that Figure 4A discloses the claim limitation requiring the inner peripheral surface 30 length to be less than that of the outer 26. Proper written description of this feature should be added to the specification with respect to this figure. Or, claim 1 should be cancelled.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
  - The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.
- 3. Claims 6 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Claims 1 and 4, from which claims 13 and 6 depend (respectively), relates to the embodiment seen in figures 4A and 4B. Neither of these figures is symmetric with respect to a radial direction line. Claims 6 and 13 should be cancelled.

#### Claim Objections

4. Claims 5, 11 and 12 are objected to because of the following informalities: claim 2 has been cancelled. A claim cannot depend from a cancelled claim. Further, "27" should be

Application/Control Number: 09/817,365 Page 3

Art Unit: 3673

deleted/changed in claims 5 and 12. Claims 1, 4, 5 and 12 relate to figures 4A/B, which do not have reference number 27. Appropriate correction is required.

## **Double Patenting**

5. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., In re Berg, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); In re Goodman, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); In re Longi, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); In re Van Ornum, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

- 6. Claims 1 and 4 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-3 of U.S. Patent No. 6,955,359. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both claim a seal assembly having a pair of rings with axially, oppositely protruding lips, a load seal ring between rings (and having an inner surface length less than that of the outer peripheral surface), and inner and outer-diameter controller bodies.
- 7. Claims 1, 4-13 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 4-11 of copending Application No. 10/950489. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct

Art Unit: 3673

from each other because both claim a crawler-track connection structure and seal assembly comprising a pair of rings with axially, oppositely protruding lips, a load seal ring between rings, and inner and outer-diameter controller bodies.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

#### Allowable Subject Matter

8. Claims 1, 4, 5, and 7-12 would be allowable if the objections and double patenting rejections are overcome.

#### Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alison K. Pickard whose telephone number is 571-272-7062. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (10-7:30), with alternate Friday's off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Shackelford can be reached on 571-272-7049. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3673

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Alison K. Pickard Primary Examiner Art Unit 3673

AP